UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/524,903	10/21/2005	Gang Li	514572002700	1640
	7590 03/31/200 : FOERSTER LLP	9	EXAMINER	
12531 HIGH BLUFF DRIVE			MARKOFF, ALEXANDER	
SUITE 100 SAN DIEGO, CA 92130-2040			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			1792	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/31/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/524,903	LI ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Alexander Markoff	1792			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	l. lely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 Octo      This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☑ This      Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under Expression 1.	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw  5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.  7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or  Application Papers  9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine  10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on 16 February 2005 is/are  Applicant may not request that any objection to the or	r election requirement. r. e: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objected	•			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct					
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>					
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/10/06 and 4/22/05.	4)  Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5)  Notice of Informal P 6)  Other:	te			

Art Unit: 1792

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 2. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Chu (US Patent No 6,291,180).

Chu teaches a method and apparatus as claimed. See entire document, especially Figures 2, 7, 8, 9 and the related description and disclosure at column 9, line 64 – column 10, line 21, column 19, lines 25-43, column 20, line 20 – column 22, line 6.

The method comprises washing the substrates, which were hybridized with a washing solution while applying ultrasound with the claimed frequency and power.

The apparatus of Chu has the claimed structure.

3. Claims 1 and 3-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ogura et al (US 2003/0022246).

Art Unit: 1792

Ogura et al teach a method and an apparatus as claimed. See entire document, especially Figure 22 and the related description and disclosure at paragraphs [0035-0053] and [0465-0548].

The method comprises washing the substrates, which were hybridized with a washing solution while applying ultrasound with the claimed frequency.

The apparatus of Chu has the claimed structure.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
- 6. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

Art Unit: 1792

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.

- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 7. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogura et al in view of Chu.

Ogura et al do not specifically recite the power of the ultrasonic wave generator.

However, applied power of the cleaning enhancement is a result effective variable.

It would have been obvious to an ordinary artisan at the time the invention was made to find an optimum value for the power by routine experimentation in order to enhance the process depending from the size of the apparatus.

Moreover, Chu teaches the claimed power as known for cleaning hybridized substrates. It would have been obvious to an ordinary artisan at the time the invention was made to use the known power recited by Chu in the method of Ogura et al because Chu teaches such power for cleaning hybridized substrates.

## Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. US Patent documents 5085982, 5374522 and 6287850 are cited with respect to cleaning methods and apparatuses.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alexander Markoff whose telephone number is 571-272-1304. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

Art Unit: 1792

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Barr can be reached on 571-272-1414. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Alexander Markoff Primary Examiner Art Unit 1792

/Alexander Markoff/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1792